Human Events YOUR WASHINGTON SERVICE

Vol. XVIII, No. 12 March 24, 1961 Section I — News

JFK: *Silent on "Mission to Moscow"* .....(177)

SCHOOLS: *Do Catholic leaders want aid?* (177)

GOP LEADERSHIP: *Congress yes, Nixon no* (178)

HOUSING: *What Kennedy's plan would cost* (179)

DODD: *Stops machinery deal to Russia* .....(180)

Mission to Moscow: Suspicion grows in the Nation's Capital that there is a strong tie-in between the release by the Russians of the two RB-47 pilots and the Administration's urgent desire to reach a nuclear test-ban agreement with the Kremlin.

President Kennedy is silent regarding the strange Moscow activities of his two top disarmament experts, Drs. Walt W. Rostow and Jerome B. Wiesner. Last November and December, in the Soviet capital, they attended the "Pugwash Conference" (named after Cyrus Eaton's home town and held in order to bring together Western and Soviet scientists to work out nuclear disarmament plans). At that time, Rostow and Wiesner laid the groundwork for the release of the airmen.

After this was revealed in the press and confirmed by the White House last week, leading Republicans speculated that the two scientists had been empowered to tell the Russians that the new President would take a more friendly view toward reaching a disarmament agreement, if the fliers were released.

Rostow provided Kennedy with a detailed memorandum of his and Wiesner's dealings with the Russians, but Kennedy has kept it under wraps—a fact which became even more frustrating last week when not one reporter recognized by Kennedy at his news conference shot him a question on the matter.

Republican congressional leaders, irked by the heavy silence hanging over the White House and concerned lest we stand on the brink of entering into a possibly disastrous treaty, are considering a demand for a congressional probe of the situation. The GOP solons consider the activities of Rostow and Wiesner a flagrant violation of the Logan Act, which forbids private citizens from dabbling in foreign policy matters without the authorization of the President—who in November and December was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Last week Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.), long wary of Red treachery in international agreements, told HUMAN EVENTS: "This mission to Moscow by two key Kennedy aides last December, in which they bartered for the release of the RB-47 pilots without any right to do so—because they held no official position with the US Government—is a matter of deep concern to Congress and to the American people. We must know what, if any, concessions were made to the Russians. As any schoolboy knows, the Russians don't give up something for nothing. What worries me most is that these two scientists are billed by the Administration as experts on disarmament. Any clandestine deal regarding disarmament might prove disastrous for the United States, and I think the people have a right to know all the facts."

What tends to strengthen the line of reasoning that concessions were offered is that both Rostow and Wiesner belong to the "we-can-do-business-with-Russia" school of thought and are strong advocates of a nuclear test ban. This reportedly runs against the advice of the Pentagon's top officials.

Wiesner has implied that the US has thus far been too demanding in its inspection requirements for a test-ban agreement. It is believed he favors fewer than the 20 *annual on-site inspections the US has been insisting upon.*

With the renewal of test ban negotiations in Geneva this week, many members of Congress consider it the Administration's duty to disclose to Congress any concessions, agreements or feelers put forth by Rostow and Wiesner in negotiating for the release of the RB-47 airmen.

Strategy in the Education Imbroglio: There may be more, much more, than meets the eye in the attitude of the Catholic hierarchy in the current controversy over Federal aid to education. "Leaks" from the diocesan chancelleries, of course, are few and far between. But there are those in the Capital who have watched the posture of the Catholic Church during a number of previous controversies over many years, and they think they perceive the basic pattern.

For one thing, experts emphasize, the prelates of the church rarely move together or—if they do—do not think identically and are not exactly harmonious in their views. But it may be true that, in general, most bishops take a very dim view of Federal aid to education, or even of getting Federal aid to Catholic schools and institutions. They justifiably fear that Federal control and interference in church affairs would follow.

Some utterances of prelates attract no little notice among those who understand these matters. For instance, on March 3 Cardinal Ritter of St. Louis said flatly he was opposed to Federal aid to education, and added that the Kennedy aid-to-education bill discriminates against those who attend private schools. Cardinal Spellman definitely did not endorse Federal aid in his statement last week.

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He said, "It is not for me to say whether there should be any Federal aid to education. That is a political and economic matter to be decided by the Congress . . . ."

Expert observers in Washington think that actually the bishops may be split on the question of Federal aid to private (including parochial) schools. It is believed that many—probably most—of the prelates in areas (usually on the eastern seaboard) of heavy Catholic populations want no Federal aid whatsoever (for the aforementioned reason). In these areas, the church enjoys ample revenues and is not hard pressed for funds. But out in the grass roots, in the South and West, a number of less affluent dioceses feel the pinch; their church leaders are more inclined to want Federal aid; they are more ready to voice the deep-felt bitterness over what they regard as an "inequitable" Federal aid bill which ignores the position of the church schools.

In the Capital, some recall the lively controversy over a proposal to give aid to parochial school buses in 1949, in which Cardinal Spellman and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt found themselves pitted against each other. At that time, HUMAN EVENTS (August 3, 1949) reported:

"The assumption that the Catholic Church is solidly behind Federal-aid-to-education, provided the parochial schools receive benefits, is incorrect. It is known that within the hierarchy there has been a profound difference of opinion. Roughly speaking, the eastern bishops have preferred no Federal aid at all, for fear of encroachment by the State. And generally western bishops have wanted Federal aid because the parochial school system in their dioceses has been weak and in need of funds. Cardinal Spellman has been of the eastern school of thought . . . ."

The situation in 1961 may be similar to that of '49, Capital observers speculate. Most big-city prelates, in kindness to their colleagues in the hinterland who have fund problems, may go along with the latter on aid to parochial schools—perhaps feeling it is a lost cause anyhow. If "lost," most of the prelates would not be unhappy, for they know the menace of Federal aid. And if their intervention into the political picture just now serves to kill the Kennedy bill for Federal aid to public schools, they might well be philosophical about the upshot. So, at least, runs the thinking of some in the Nation's Capital.

Capitol Camera: Some pros on Capitol Hill believe that Kennedy, in his firm stand against inclusion of parochial school aid in the Federal aid to education measure, is making a pitch for the Bible belt vote; he realizes he lost much of this in the election, wants to grandstand and regain grass-roots support. Maybe; but how about losing many Catholic votes? It is rumored that Vice President Lyndon Johnson is of the opinion that the controversy is going to inflict some grave scars on the body of the Democratic party.

• *It is noted that the unemployment compensation extension bill was passed in the House without being amended in any way. This happened because the enlarged majority on the Rules Committee, loyal to "Mr. Czar" Rayburn, imposed a "gag rule" which prevented any member from offering an amendment. Veteran observers see this as another excellent example of the "democratic process" brought about by the Rules Committee packing.*

• Among newsmen in the Capital, as well as members of Congress, the exploitation by the White House publicity staff of daughter Caroline stirs wide merriment and many knowing winks. Some members of Congress, usually Republicans, become a bit tart about this game. So much so, that New York Representative Katharine St. George—who has long been allergic to White House public relations capers—ad libbed the following in her speech to Republican women arraigning the do-nothing Kennedy regime: "Caroline is a very cute little girl and all that. But why doesn't *he* do something?"

• *The Young Republicans will hold their annual national convention June* 21-24 *in Minneapolis. Both Nixon and Governor Nelson Rockefeller have sent their regrets, but Senator Barry Goldwater will attend. One of the YR's in charge of preparations told* HUMAN EVENTS: *"If all three had accepted, there isn't much doubt about which one would have gotten the biggest reception. I suspect that this was a factor in regard to the negative replies."*

• There are 19 freshman Republican Congressmen under 40, and 18 of them (almost all strong conservatives) ran well ahead of President Kennedy in their districts. F. Bradford Morse, of Kennedy's home state, fell slightly short of the latter's margin of victory, but Morse still received 54.5 per cent of the vote in defeating his Democratic opponent.

• *Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, in his debate with Goldwater, cited a Labor Department study of the* $1 *minimum wage law passed in* 1956 *to prove that the minimum wage had no effect on employment. Goldberg did not mention, however, that the Department of Labor study omits from its findings the number of businesses that failed after enactment of the law. (Among other reasons, Kennedy's current proposal for hiking the minimum wage is criticized on the ground that it would bankrupt many marginal business firms.)*

Speaking for GOP: On Capitol Hill, one hears no more suggestions that either former President Eisenhower (not that he would ever want to) or Nixon will speak for the Republican party. A GOP Leadership Conference has been set up to perform that role—all agree that the Republicans in Congress must shape the policy on which the GOP will run in the 1962 elections. The Conference has as chairman National Chairman (and Senator) Thruston Morton. The House is represented by GOP leader Charles Halleck (Ind.), Leslie Arends (Ill.), the whip, Wisconsin's John Byrnes (chairman of the House Policy Committee), Charles Hoeven (Iowa)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Clarence Brown (Ohio); the Senate—party leader Everett Dirksen (Ill.), Styles Bridges (N.H.), head of the Senate Policy Committee, Leverett Saltonstall (Mass.), chairman of the Senate Republican Conference Committee and Thomas Kuchel (Calif.), the whip.

Recently Bridges urged that Goldwater, head of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, and Congressman William E. Miller, chairman of the House Congressional (campaign) Committee, be added.

The Leadership Conference has delayed acceding to Bridges' proposal, because of objections that the present membership includes only regular leaders in the parliamentary party regime; adding campaign chairmen would depart from this pattern. But, it is understood, these objections are minimized and Miller and Goldwater will be added to the Conference. Bridges argued that it is necessary to mesh the upcoming election with the policy-making now going on under the capable leadership of Halleck and Dirksen.

No real conflict—although liberals in the press seek to picture it as an attempt to bar Goldwater because he is too conservative (the current line of those seeking to clobber him). Actually, Bridges did not exclusively boost Goldwater for membership; he wanted both Goldwater and Miller. Incidentally, Miller is just about as conservative as Goldwater, judging by the voting record. On the ACA (Americans for Constitutional Action) voting score sheet, Miller is rated 96% conservative, Goldwater, 98%.

Nixon: When former Vice President Richard Nixon said last week he did not intend to run for Governor of California, pros in Washington reacted variously. Some said it was the end of Nixon (although he probably did not realize it). Others thought Nixon was simply getting himself in a position where the party might have to draft him for the gubernatorial race. Private sources from Los Angeles suggest that Nixon sniffed the wind, after his return home, decided that Democrat Edmund "Pat" Brown might be very difficult to defeat and made up his mind to wait and see.

Pros suspend judgment on Nixon's future, despite many pessimistic reports. For they note that the highly respected Field California Poll recently found that 51 per cent of California voters say they would vote for Nixon for Governor, 40 per cent for Governor Brown, and nine per cent are undecided. "Wait and see. . . ."

Industrial "Pirating": Senator Kenneth Keating (R.-N.Y.) last week spoke out against aspects of the Senate-passed, Administration-sponsored Area Redevelopment bill, which would grant companies funds to build plants in areas with high unemployment.

Keating expressed fear that the bill would "simply result in shuffling of industries from one area to another." The New Yorker referred to this as "industrial pirating." Keating said that the problem was to create jobs, not to build new plants (which GOP Senator Wallace Bennett of Utah says wouldn't be ready for a year to 18 months anyway). Keating expressed concern over the "dangers and pitfalls involved in having this program become another backdoor spending scheme," adding that "the Congress is supposed to keep an eye on our Federal purse strings. Why must the Federal area redevelopment program be an exception?"

Housing Program: Congressman Thomas M. Pelly (R.-Wash.) has severely criticized the Kennedy housing message submitted to Congress earlier this month. Congressman Pelly estimates that the Administration's proposal would cost $6.8 billion and that only $50 million, or less than one per cent of the cost, will actually be subject to scrutiny by the House Appropriations Committee. "The other 99 per cent," says Pelly, "will either involve loans from the Treasury or contractual obligations that will leave no room for discretion or judgment by the Appropriations Committee."

Pelly also scored Kennedy for requesting that $1.35 billion for college housing be considered as a separate bill. The Washington Congressman claimed that this would be "without precedent," since the college housing program has always been included in the omnibus housing programs. It is also noted that Kennedy's plan would be far more costly than the $2 billion housing program passed last year.

Here is how Pelly itemizes the expense of the housing program:

• FNMA "special assistance" for low-interest loans for middle income family rental housing	$ 500 million
• Forty-year subsidies for 100,000 additional public housing units	1,943 million
• Increase in 40-year subsidies for 50,000 public housing units for elderly persons	240 million
• Increase in direct loans for elderly persons housing	50 million
• Urban renewal capital grants	2,500 million
• Urban renewal planning grants	80 million
• Loans and grants for acquisition of open spaces	100 million
• Community facility loans	50 million
• College housing loans	1,350 million
Total	$6,813 million

Secrecy in Government: Everybody in the press in the Capital knows that government censorship on all matters which the Administration chooses to keep secret has reached a stage more airtight than any experienced since the days of World War II. "Everybody" knows it, but few editors try to challenge the censorship. A number of military men are privately outraged by this censorship and circulate socially asking why the press puts up with it. They point out that the Eisenhower regime was constantly and often unfairly criticized for such censorship—although it was handsomely communicative compared with the Kennedy regime.

WILLIAM E. MILLER, Republican Congressman from New York: "I have noted HUMAN EVENTS with interest for the past several years. I have found it to be most informative and helpful."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Many in the press squirm, because—under the leadership of the Washington *Post*—ultra-liberal morning daily, a great to-do was made of this matter under the GOP Administration. That paper plays the theme in low key today. However, the largest p. m. Washington paper, the *Evening Star*, has now risen to challenge the present censorship. In the Dean Rusk affair (see HUMAN EVENTS for March 10), the *Star* editor stood behind his reporters when they ran a well-authenticated story on the Secretary of State's memorandum to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, proposing a change in our massive atomic retaliation strategy. The *Star* was much more firm and courageous, in face of Executive displeasure, than has been publicly mentioned.

Now, the *Star* goes after, editorially, a "secret conference on secrecy" held by (of all people) Representative John E. Moss, liberal California Democrat, who was responsible for much of the criticism of the Eisenhower secrecy regulations in recent years. Moss called a meeting of newspaper editors, members of Congress and government press secretaries last week, but excluded reporters. The *Star* attacks the Moss action:

"Policies relating to secrecy in government should be openly arrived at. The sinister implications of a secret meeting devoted to discussion of government secrecy are obvious."

Many members of Congress applaud the *Star*, which is rapidly becoming one of the best sources of news, especially news covered up by government censorship. They wish the *Star* would start a morning edition to challenge the unhealthy monopoly in the morning field which the liberal Washington *Post* maintains.

As Reds See Kennedy's Program: A recent issue of the *Worker*, the official Communist Party of the USA newspaper, shows that the Reds are very unhappy over the "GOP-Dixiecrat barrier," which it says is holding up President Kennedy's 16-point "recovery" program.

The *Worker* said that "spokesmen of the ultra-reactionary coalition make no secret of their intention to block, postpone or whittle down most of the economic relief measures requested by the Kennedy Administration." It noted that the picture was not all dark, because "the reactionary forces were, of course, hurt by the enlargement of the House Rules Committee . . . .

"The big question," the Communist organ stated, "is what the backers of the President's program will do at the grass roots level to counter the reactionary drive." The *Worker* lauded the "positive proposals" which Kennedy is sponsoring. These "positive proposals" included the Area Redevelopment bill (see HUMAN EVENTS, March 17) and a minimum wage boost (see HUMAN EVENTS, March 10).

No Machinery to Russia: Thanks to the vigilance of two United States Senators, the Soviet Union is being deprived of valuable American machinery used in the manufacture of ball bearings.

Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges last month overruled strong Defense Department suggestions that the sale of 45 precision grinding machines could be of military value to the Russians. Hodges said that the Russians could buy them from other nations anyway, and that they were of no military consequence. On the floor of the Senate, Senator John J. Williams (R.-Del.) said: "If these are the criteria which are to be used in determining the eligibility for the resumption of trade with Russia, then let us recognize the fact that all bars are down . . . . Why withhold the shipment of steel, tanks, guns or other types of military equipment? This equipment is manufactured in other countries as well."

In rebuttal to the Hodges argument that the machines are not strategic, Senator Thomas Dodd (D.-Conn.) wrote 12 industrial experts and asked whether they thought such machinery was of military value. All 12 told Dodd that the machinery was "vital" and "absolutely important" for such purposes. Now, in the face of these Senate criticisms, Hodges has ordered that the deal be cancelled. Senator Dodd has been amply rewarded for his efforts—with a violent attack on him by the Moscow newspaper *Izvestia*.

The Press Spoofs the Politicos: The Gridiron Club, composed of 50 leading Washington newsmen, recently held its annual dinner to spoof the nation's leading political figures. The skits often reflect the off-the-cuff opinions of the newsmen closest to the top politicos.

President Kennedy was liberally jabbed for the nepotism in his Administration with a variation of a tune from "HMS Pinafore" about "his sisters and his cousins and his aunts. And also his brothers and his in-laws and his aunts." Chicago's Democratic bosses, Mayor Richard Daley and Jake Arvey, were shown stealing votes to the tune of "Tea for Two"—"Two for You and Three for Me." Richard Nixon was pictured as carrying Nelson Rockefeller on his back, while singing about reporters forming a "claque for Jack"—a reference to the rough press corps treatment Nixon received during the late campaign.

Rocky was portrayed as singing, "Just tax hell out of everybody, and when they're good and mad give it back to them." This was a reference to Rocky's tax rebate this year following two years of high-tax government in New York.

Published weekly at 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50; 3 months $3.50. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

For change of address send old address **EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS** on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number, if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $20. Only 1956 and 1960 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT GEORGE O. FOWLER
ALLAN H. RYSKIND SVEND PETERSEN
Business Manager: W. B. HICKS, JR. *Contributing Editor*: FRANK CHODOROV

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS
-- What YOU Can Do --

REPRINTS available. When ordering, identify as WHAT YOU CAN DO Section for March 24, 1961. Single copy 20c; 10 for $1; 25 for $2; 100 for $5; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30.

Vol. XVIII, No. 12 — Section II March 24, 1961

The King-'Kennedy' Health Plan

H.R. 4222: A foot-in-the-door for Socialized Medicine

Why do you call it the King-"Kennedy" health plan?

Because Democratic Congressman Cecil R. King of California (ACA rating 3) introduced the bill in this session of Congress that embodies ideas that President Kennedy as Senator (ACA 11) had in his health care proposal last year. It more accurately ought to be called the King—"Kennedy"—Cohen plan.

Why add Cohen?

Because Prof. Wilbur Cohen masterminded the new version and is planning the tactics behind the scenes and calling the signals to push this "foot-in-the-door" plan through Congress. Cohen, designated by the President as Assistant Health, Education and Welfare Secretary for legislative matters, has long been an advocate of compulsory health insurance.

Why do you call it a "foot-in-the-door" plan to socialize medicine?

Because by toning down the language of the Forand Bill of last year, eliminating some of the glaring objections and making it appear to be more modest, the planners expect to get the **principle** of government's responsibility for health established—then to move for expansion—and finally achieve a fully socialized medical system in America.

What does the bill propose to do?

It would provide principally for:

(a) Inpatient hospital "services" for up to 90 days, in excess of $10 for the first nine days and full "service" cost for the remaining 81 days.

(b) 180 days nursing care after hospitalization.

(c) Hospital out-patient diagnostic services for all costs over $20.

(d) 240 daily visits of "home health services."

Is this for everybody?

No, not now. At present it would cover only all over 65 who are eligible for Social Security or Railroad Retirement payments, whether they are working or not. About 4 or 5 million over 65 would not be covered.

Does it include the payment of physicians' bills?

No, it does not.

Why is that, since surgery, for instance, was included in the For-and Bill?

Perhaps to keep the physicians from working against the bill, to make it look cheaper, and to attempt to remove the physician-patient relationship argument.

What would it cost?

Prof. Cohen and his associates estimate it at $1.1 billion for the first year. The plan would start in 1963. Experts in the medical care field, however, estimate that a more realistic starting figure would be over $2 billion.

How would it be paid for?

For the present, it is proposed that the funds come from an increase in the payroll tax. This would be done by raising the present payroll tax to 6½ per cent on a wage base of $5,000. This means a total payroll tax increase from $288 to $325 for every wage earner.

In addition, on the basis of the President's message of February 2, another 1% will be called for on a wage base of $5,000 to cover increased Social Security payments. So the payroll tax-take will be $375 a year. This is not the end. The law already provides, under present Social Security payments, that the tax will go to 9% by 1969. These payments will bring it to 11%. The bookkeeping, of course, shows that half comes from the employer and half from the worker. The truth is the worker pays it all.

It has been estimated that if we get fully socialized medicine and other benefits under Social Security, the payroll tax will have to be raised to 20%. Remember, it started at 3% on $3,000 in 1935. The next step will logically be a graduated payroll tax, if the experience with the income tax teaches anything.

Are these accurate figures and projections?

They are arrived at by using the very figures now on the law books and in the proposed plans. Besides the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare has not denied the growing tax concept. On NBC television, "Meet the Press," February 18, Jack Steele of Scripps-Howard newspapers observed that "at present the top Social Security tax for an employed person is $144 per year. Under this program, I believe, in a couple of years they will go up to $200 and eventually to $250, which on both [employer and employees] means $500 a year. So a great many people will be paying more Social Security taxes than they pay income taxes."

Ribicoff replied: "Mr. Steele, if our economy remains static, and if our wages remain the same, I would say that we were about reaching the maximum we could charge, but none of us can anticipate what the future will be . . . . "

What's the difference between the King-"Kennedy" bill and that introduced by Senator McNamara of Michigan?

Chiefly, it's easier to sell. It's more innocent looking and is calculated to stir up less opposition. Getting the **principle** of **government intervention** in individual **health matters** is the goal this year. A tip-off is HEW Secretary Ribicoff's statement made at his first press conference when he said that "the Kennedy Administration wants to confine its health care legislation **this year** to persons who receive Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits."

What other evidence is there that this is just a foot-in-the-door to centralized administration of a medical program for all?

The Cohen (Kennedy) Task Force said in its report of January 10, 1961, "The task force has confined itself to the most immediate necessities for Federal action, and **does not** present its recommendations as a complete program for

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

health and welfare." But even this "modest" report included:

1. Medical Care for the Aged and Other Social Security Beneficiaries.

2. Medical Education and Medical Manpower.

3. Medical Research.

4. Medical Care Facilities.

5. Establishment of a National Academy of Health.

6. Creation of a National Institute of Child Health.

7. Assistance to Children of an Unemployed Parent.

8. Preparation of a Family and Child Welfare Services Plan.

9. Strengthening and Streamlining Administrative Organization in HEW.

Three programs, they said, are not yet ready for release! Several of the above have been presented already in separate bills to Congress.

What about some of the promoters of the "Social Security approach to health schemes?" Do they consider it a foot-in-the-door approach, too?

Apparently, from what some of them say. Here are examples:

(1): Ex-Congressman Aime J. Forand, the father of legislation promoting the financing of a medical care program for the aged through the Social Security mechanism (the basis of the King-"Kennedy" plan for financing), after the White House Conference on Aging, said: "If we can only break through and get our **foot inside the door,** then we can expand the program after that."

(2): The Communist Party of Illinois distributed a brochure entitled "The Forand Bill Can Be Won Now!" (The Forand Bill was the forerunner of the present King-"Kennedy" plan.) This brochure, under the subtitle "The Forand Bill is the Minimum," let the cat out of the bag. It said: "The virtue of the Forand Bill is that it is a Federal rather than a State-aid measure and is built into the Social Security system. With all its present limitation, the Forand Bill **opens the door toward complete hospital, medical and surgical services for the aged—and ultimately for the whole population.** It can be enacted at once by this session of Congress."

(3): The December 1, 1960, supplement to "New America," the official publication of the Socialist Party, was devoted to the support of the Forand Bill and its extension to every one in the United States. It said in part, "The Forand Bill's limitation will be only the limitations of Social Security itself—which, though important, do not subtract from the precedent this bill will establish . . . the Forand Bill will not be paid for on insurance principles, according to factors of estimated 'risk.' It will be paid for through the tax mechanisms of Social Security—that is, **Americans will pay according to their means, and receive (within limits) according to their needs. . . .** Once the Forand Bill is passed, this nation will be provided with a mechanism for socialized medicine, capable of **indefinite expansion in every direction until it includes the entire population.** And it is already evident that there will be massive pressures in favor of such expansion."

And the Socialists ought to know!

(4): On February 27th, Senator George A. Smathers (Dem.) (ACA 38), apparently speaking for the New Frontiersmen, said that the crucial test in the next two years "is not only to pass as many bills as possible, but to create a climate for a legislative breakthrough in 1963. Democrats lost strength in the last election [and he apparently means liberal Democrats because all the Constitutional Conservatives are back] and is reflected in the kind of 'moderate' program the President has asked for."

Pretty good proof of why the King-"Kennedy" socialized medicine bill has been toned down and called moderate, isn't it? Isn't this proof enough of a foot-in-the-door proposal?

(5): But for the skeptic, how about this for a clincher?

President Kennedy's own Postmaster General, J. Edward Day, only nine months ago wrote: "The Forand Bill, if enacted, is bound to be only a first step to an enormously expanded and still more expensive federal health care program." He said further, "Already we are postponing the evil day on paying for the present Social Security benefit structure. When it comes to the multi-billion dollar addition to the structure by the Forand Bill—we can't afford it."

(6): The AFL-CIO Executive Council met recently in Florida (Bal Harbour). It showed disappointment in the deductible feature of the King-"Kennedy" plan, but urged prompt passage of the bill because "it provides framework" for a "sound constructive program. . . ." There isn't much difference between "framework" and "foot-in-the-door!"

But some Congressmen have said that they are not for going any further than this bill. And Secretary Ribicoff says, "read the Bill."

This completely ignores (1) the Fabian Socialists' tactics and (2) history.

For example:

We were told that the Federal income tax would never go beyond 2% and only the rich would be soaked! (How much did you pay this year?)

We were told excise taxes were to reduce consumer spending during the war. They are still here. Twenty-seven years ago farmers were told that government help would not mean Federal controls (ask a farmer about this one now) and "extra" Federal employees were added to work during the "emergency" of the depression. Do you know any Federal department that has gotten smaller since?

Do you suppose any Russian influence is involved?

This is hard to say. But it is interesting to note that the US Government sent a delegation of top officials in HEW to Russia to study their Social Security and government health schemes. They were gone one month. They came back and made a report pointing out that the Russian program "is quite liberal."

But doesn't the Administration realize the danger in a big, centralized government operating a so-called "Welfare State?"

Apparently not. If one looks at the training most of the behind-the-scenes-advisers to the President have had, or read their speeches and articles, it is easy to see what direction they want America to go. And they are pulling the strings in that direction. Keep in mind that even Kennedy, like Fabian Socialists, studied at the well-known, left-wing London School of Economics. In addition, he was trained at Harvard, the center for the Keynesian school of thought in America.

Some members of the Administration have said that they are not afraid of big government. Does this mean the HEW Secretary wants a socialized America?

Probably not. But this cannot be said of most of the do-gooders who control his Department. Nor can it be said of many of the appointees in the new Administration. For instance, UPI reported on January 31 that Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. (Kennedy's adviser) said, as a "private citizen," that the **Welfare State is the best defense against Communism!** Apparently most of the Cabinet members completely ignore the lessons of history and are blind to the oppression conducted by centralized governments in many parts of the world—which is the inevitable result of centralized power. And besides, many second-string officials of the New Frontier variety have been paid lobbyists for "centralized government promoting" outfits. This probably helped qualify them for their new jobs.

Who is the brain-trust behind the King-"Kennedy" scheme?

The chief architect is Professor Wilbur Cohen. His philosophy is well known, particularly by those who want to move us into a completely socialized state. He was an avid supporter of the ill-fated Murray-Wagner-Dingell Bill of a few years back, which provided for central government controlled compulsory health insurance for everybody. His appointment as Assistant HEW Secretary has not yet been confirmed, but he is working like a true New Frontiersman in the Department.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is there a medical "need" for those over 65?

Of course there is. But there is, also, a need for some of those over 60 or over 45 or over 21 or under five. But the American society based on Judeo-Christian principles, and the economic system growing out of them, is that the responsibility for meeting that need—or any other economic need—rests first with the individual and then with the family. In fact, we have a need for food, housing, clothing, transportation and a bank account, but so far (in contrast with the Socialists) we have said that the responsibility for meeting them rests with the individual—not with centralized government. Under this system we have developed the finest medical record in the world, and have added 20 years to our life expectancy.

Why do you suppose that at age 65 the responsibility for meeting the health needs is suddenly to be shifted to the central government?

If you don't believe in or understand the American system, you could set this shift at any age. Remember, this is a foot-in-the-door program, and age 65 fits the tactical design for the Fabian Socialists very well. And even though their arguments, on examination, are spurious, there are many factors that can be turned to "enlist" support for their schemes on emotional grounds.

What are some of these factors?

First. Age 65 is considered retirement age, and the image is created that suddenly they are off the payroll and have either a very low income or none at all.

Second. Inflation, created by hundreds of Federal spending schemes, has indeed cut the buying power of the savings of the older persons. This is a cruel blow and further Federal squandering will make it worse.

Third. There is a small percentage of the elderly—as with any age group—which has exceedingly large medical bills. When Prof. Cohen was asked how many needy there are, he answered, "I don't know. You can't tell until they apply." Yet he designed a plan on the premise that all over 65 need the Federal government's intervention. When these big bills hit those who have not prepared themselves financially for them or whose savings have been robbed by inflation (created by the same bleeding hearts who now want to do good), obviously a plausible sounding emotionally-packed case history can be made of it.

Fourth. It's easily whipped up into a hoped for vote-getter, and the number over age 65 is (a) growing and (b) is concentrated in politically strategic spots. Bear in mind that Congressman King comes from an area which gave birth to and still generates Townsend Plan-like panaceas.

Do our Senior Citizens really want the Federal government in their health affairs?

There are a lot of rigged figures designed to show that they do. There are, also, a few organized groups of older folks, carefully nurtured by welfare staters, who are used to plead the case. But the elections showed the opposite. For instance, the vote in Cleveland showed that 75% of the older citizens voted against Kennedy. St. Petersburg (having the highest percentage of older people of any city in Florida) went 4 to 1 against him, though he made his medical program clear. You will recall that it was apparently necessary to distort the truth with an older couple on television in order to make a case during the campaign. This kind of distortion was repeated by Edward R. Murrow on a CBS television show recently. **Human Events** described Murrow's tactics at some length in its issue of February 17.

Objective experts know differently. For instance, Right Rev. Monsignor Augustine C. Dalton, Director of Catholic Hospitals, Archdiocese of Boston, said:

> "From all that I have observed, heard, or read, it is my opinion that the problem of our aged citizens is an overexaggerated one. Reliable authorities appear to be unanimous in stating that the vast majority of those sixty-five years and over present no especial problem, they can handle their own situations well or have them handled satisfactorily by those near and dear to them.
>
> "It is with regard to the minority that any problem exists. This minority lacks the financial means, the physical or mental health, devoted relatives, the will to make a go of it, or just plain knowledge of how to live with their age."

It is argued that the King-"Kennedy" proposal is not socialism since it "does not disturb the doctor-patient relationship" or that "the receiver can choose any hospital." What are the facts?

This argument begs the whole question and fails to recognize what socialism is and what devious methods are employed by the Fabian Socialists to achieve their ends.

What do you mean by this?

First, the strategists recognized that the physician-patient relationship as practiced in America is very sacred. The Forand Bill and the previous Murray-Wagner-Dingell Bill were openly vulnerable to the charge—though denied—that this vital relationship would be destroyed, and a big storm of protests arose. So King-"Kennedy" planners attempt to muffle these protests by **not including physicians' fees** in this particular legislation. Now "how could the patient-doctor relationship be disturbed when they—the doctors—are not included?" A smart trick—but remember, this is part of the foot-in-the-door maneuver, said Ex-Congressman Forand, and a "first step" said Frontier Cabinet member Day!

It's rather significant that Mr. Kennedy (ACA rating 11) should find it necessary to label this "not socialism" and that the left-wing press agents and columnists say they "hope socialism won't be brought into the debate on this question."

Second, beyond this the Supreme Court has ruled "that which the government subsidizes it can control."

Will the actual practice of medicine be affected?

Yes, it will. It's hard to imagine that a bill that's 70 pages long (plus the administrative orders that will follow) can institute a program that does not change the practice of medicine. One provision, for example, makes this crystal clear to physicians, though the technical language hides its real meaning from most citizens.

What provision is this?

It's the provision that will give **outpatient hospital diagnostic services.** This provision will require:

> A. That hospitals **employ doctors.** This is not now the case.
>
> B. That the patient get his **diagnostic** service from a doctor employed by the hospital—not from his family physician. Otherwise he cannot get his so-called service.

Remember that unlike other Social Security benefits that are paid in cash to be spent as the receiver wishes, this program provides "services" to be paid for by the central government. This changes completely the idea underlying Social Security. So when you add the fact that you can only choose a hospital under government contract "for care," to the fact that you can get your diagnosis paid for only as a "hospital outpatient," to the fact that the Supreme Court has said that anything the Federal Government subsidizes, it can control, it would seem that it ought to be clear where this program will lead us—whether by design or accidentally!

Some labor boss propaganda says that private insurance companies won't move into the field for those over 65 because "they can't make money on it" and the "old folks can't buy health insurance" because premiums are too high. What's the truth?

Regarding the first point, the percentage of persons who are providing for their own hospital care through private insurance is constantly rising. It has gone from 9% in 1940 to 50% in 1950 to over 72% now. In a similar manner, private health insurance coverage for the aged has moved up from 26% in 1952 to 43% in 1957 and nearly 60% now. It is estimated that 75% needing and wanting it will be covered by 1965 and 90% by 1970 (barring government interference). New plans and policies are constantly being offered. Even AFL-CIO has admitted that "private prepayment plans for medical care insurance have grown mightily." The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

second argument is even more spurious. If government can sell health care cheaper than private industry, it is only because it is subsidized and somebody else pays. That's exactly the case here—it will be paid for by the young people—and if this doesn't meet the bill, general revenues will be used. Besides, keep in mind that this is not now a medical care program at all—it primarily gives limited hospitalization and nursing service.

It is said that the older folks cannot pay for medical care because their incomes are too low.

Obviously, there are some cases. This is true when catastrophic or prolonged illnesses occur. However, this is not true so far as perhaps 80 to 90% are concerned. Competent studies show (1) that the average income of those over 65 is greater than the average under 65; (2) most of those over 65 have a home paid for; (3) living costs for the elderly are lower; (4) their family obligations, such as raising children and paying for their cost of education, have been discharged and most of them are covered or could be by private medical and hospital plans.

What about those you mention who have unexpected and prolonged illnesses and high costs?

Over the years there have been developed all types of health care programs for the needy or near-needy. These programs, in which the local community and the state share costs, are locally controlled and locally operated. Many religious and fraternal organizations have developed excellent facilities and procedures. However, the number of persons over 65 has increased, and with Federal government taking more and more of tax revenues for its own use, some states and communities have found it difficult to provide for these near-needy, even though they are relatively few in number. Congress last year passed the Kerr-Mills bill which helps the states to carry on and expand their programs under local control and locally determined standards. Many states are in the process of putting legs under this program already, although it was passed only late last summer. Of course, if the states and communities can be led to expect something "free" from the central government, the process of doing something more on their own will be slowed or stopped. This fits the plan perfectly for those who want more central government.

Does the King-"Kennedy"-Cohen plan (H.R. 4222) take care of all the health needs of all those over 65 who need health care?

No, it does not. In fact it makes a few services available for all those under Social Security and the Railroad Retirement Act—that's all. It's for those on a payroll as well as those who are not. 80% of these do not need it. Yet this plan creates the illusion for all the needy and the near-needy that their health worries are over—the government will take care of them.

Why do you suppose such a peculiarly limited bill has been drawn and yet is being sold as a great "modest" thing?

The simplest answer is—because this is a "foot-in-the-door" proposal. The early proponents of socialized medicine in America had a full program providing for compulsory health insurance and wrapped it up in the Murray-Wagner-Dingell Bill. But the earmarks of Socialized Medicine stuck out all over, and the public could see what it was and wanted none of it. Congress gallantly defeated it. So they have taken a lesson out of the handbook of the Fabian Socialists and said, "Let's get a little at a time. First establish that it is the government's business to operate a so-called health insurance service. Make it appear inexpensive. Make it look innocent. Provide only for a few. Give only a few services. Buy off a few groups who might gain by it. Then let the pressure build up from the natural reaction, 'I'm paying for it, why can't I have it, too?' or 'This is not enough, why not give me more as I expected?' Then loudly proclaim, as it was necessary for the President of the United States to proclaim, 'This is not Socialism.'"—call it something nice like "Welfare" or "Insurance." Might we wonder why it must be labelled "Not Socialism?" Apparently all the earmarks of socialism cannot be hidden—which, of course, they are not.

It is argued that the White House Conference on Aging endorsed the idea of tying the so-called health care to the Social Security system. Is this true?

No. The conference as a whole did **not.** It was not supposed to vote. Two sections were authorized to vote on this idea—**one was for it**—the **other was not.** Even so, it must be kept in mind that the conference was packed with payrollers, do-gooders, and puppets. Some reporters, however, were not fooled. C. L. Clancy of the Peoria **Journal Star** said, with a headline, for instance, "White House Conference on Aging a Fraud." He then went on to say, "The bureaucrats merely wanted to use such an assembly to publicize their own pet schemes, and to stake a claim that the 'grass roots' demand is for exactly what the bureaucrats want. And all this to be publicly waved under the noses of the legislators who vote the funds to make possible an increase in bureaucrats and promotion for those here now." Even so, Senator Paul Douglas (ACA rating 15) said he was "frankly surprised at the limited victory" for the Social Security tie-in for medical care.

How are the labor bosses promoting the plan?

By propaganda and pressure of all kinds. One gimmick has been to employ a flock of elderly people to go from house to house and canvass for promises "to write to your Congressman."

Physicians have been criticized for opposing such bills as the "Forand" measure and the current King-"Kennedy"-Cohen bill, claiming it mixes medicine with politics. Is this true?

Physicians better get busy and exercise their basic citizenship responsibilities and oppose all foot-in-the-door plans for socialized medicine, for if the King-"Kennedy"-Cohen proposal is passed, physicians will be up to their stethoscopes in politics—whether they want to be or not. It will be too late for them, then. Socialized medicine is bad medicine, and should not be prescribed. The medical profession, as a group of citizens, ought to fight political quackery as strongly as it fights medical quackery.

But aren't doctors' fees too high?

In most communities it costs more to get a plumber, or a television repairman, than it does to get the professional service of a doctor on a house-call.

Have doctors opposed Forand-type legislation for fear the government would set their fees?

There is no evidence that this is the case. Even so, it would be only a small part of their reason. Yet it is as dangerous and objectionable for government to fix doctors' fees as it would be to fix wages or prices, if we want to retain some semblance of a free society. But this bill is of prime concern to all—it's not just the physicians' fight.

What can be done?

We must rely on the members of the House and the Senate, because the Administration is not interested in stopping big, centralized government. So . . .

1. Make your views known to every member of the House Ways and Means Committee, but especially to those from your district. *

2. Write cards and letters to your Congressmen and Senators—and get your friends, neighbors and club members to do the same. Tell them why you oppose this plan—and all others like it.

---

* Members of the House Committee on Ways and Means are: Democrats—Wilbur D. Mills (Ark.) (Chairman), Cecil R. King (Calif.), Thomas J. O'Brien (Ill.), Hale Boggs (La.), Eugene J. Keogh (N.Y.), Burr P. Harrison (Va.), Frank M. Karsten (Mo.), A. Sydney Herlong, Jr. (Fla.), Frank N. Ikard (Tex.), Thaddeus M. Machrowicz (Mich.), James B. Frazier, Jr. (Tenn.), William J. Green, Jr. (Penna.), John C. Watts (Ky.), Albert C. Ullman (Ore.), and James E. Burke (Mass.); Republicans—Noah M. Mason (Ill.), John W. Byrnes (Wisc.), Howard H. Baker (Tenn.), Thomas B. Curtis (Mo.), Victor A. Knox (Mich.), James B. Utt (Calif.), Jackson E. Betts (Ohio), Bruce Alger (Tex.), Steven B. Derounian (N.Y.), and Herman T. Schneebeli (Penna.).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MULTIPLY yourself by mailing to someone else each section of HUMAN EVENTS, after you have read it.

HUMAN EVENTS

--- COMMENTARY ---

The something for nothing boys mean something for themselves and nothing for you.

Vol. XVIII, No. 12 — Section III

March 24, 1961

Labor Union Mischief

By Fulton Lewis, Jr.

The Senate Rackets Committee is a thing of the past, but the arrogant labor bosses whom it exposed for more than four years unfortunately are not.

The Committee, which first hurtled Attorney General Kennedy into the national limelight, died when its charter was not extended at the end of the last Congress. Findings of the Committee's last investigation—completed after the group's final report—have been handed over to the Justice Department, the Internal Revenue Service and the State of Arkansas, for action.

The probe concerned an $82 million Federal Arsenal project in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, and the leaders of Local 706 of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe-fitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

The investigation, which began early last year, was carried out in extreme quiet with all hearings held in executive session and newsmen barred. After a year of digging, the following charges have been made. Officials of the union misappropriated large sums of money from members forced to kick back in order to hold jobs; more than $100,000 collected by the Local simply disappeared; officials rigged a union election involving members of the Local; the Arkansas right-to-work law was flagrantly violated.

National Union officials have been given voluminous evidence by Sen. McClellan reflecting the Local's leadership, particularly Earl Griffin, 706's financial secretary and treasurer. The Union has refused to discipline Griffin, despite these charges:

*Although Arkansas has a right-to-work law, workers desiring employment on the project were forced to pay Griffin $3.50 a week. This violated the legal provisions of the union's international constitution; the Federal kickback statute, Title 18, section 874 of the U.S. Code; and the Arkansas right-to-work law.

*Approximately $118,444.22 of funds collected by Earl Griffin's local from workers on the Pine Bluff job mysteriously disappeared. Of a total of $214,976 collected over a two-year period ending in June of 1953, only $103,531.78 was deposited in the union's joint-venture bank account.

*Earl and his brother Ernon Griffin were accused of "extravagant and unnecessary expenditures" from local 706 during the years 1952-58. The union collected more than $735,000 during those years and spent in excess of $631,000. As of August 17, 1960, less than $10,000 remained in the treasury.

CHANGING THE GOLD ROOM INTO THE RED ROOM

An example of a "questionable expenditure" was $71,880 for two airplanes, one of which the Local still operates. Other items include duck stamps, rifles, pump guns, fishing rods, hunting pants and coats, fishing reels, a 14-foot boat, outboard motors, etc. No breakdown was ever furnished to the general membership of the union.

*In December, 1955, after Earl Griffin became an international representative of the United Association, with jurisdiction over pipelines in the Tulsa, Oklahoma, area he and his brother participated in the rigging of an election in Local 798 in Tulsa.

Through the efforts of the brothers Griffin, it is further charged, the union books of some 40 members of Local 706 union members were transferred to the Tulsa local eleven days before the election. On December 11, 1955, these Local 706 union members were transported from their El Dorado, Arkansas union hall to a polling place in Baton Rouge, La., one of the sites selected for the Local 798 election.

These men—representing ten per cent of the voters—were instructed to vote for Jim Craddock as Local 798 business manager, according to Sen. McClellan, and thanks in part to the illegal votes, Craddock was re-elected.

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bolivia: Another US Failure Abroad

Copyright, 1961, Barron's Publishing Co., Inc.

"Bolivia," somebody once remarked, "is not a country but a joke—and a very sad one at that." These days, it seems, the joke is on the U.S. Government and on the American taxpayer. A fortnight ago the Inter-American Development Bank, a half-billion-dollar hemispheric lending institution which has just opened its doors for business, hastily approved a special credit of $10 million to La Paz. Last week President Kennedy dispatched a special three-man task force to the unhappy Andean land to grapple with the latest in an apparently endless series of economic crises. After nearly a decade of generous U.S. financial aid, running at last count to more than $200 million, the country is reported to be tottering on the brink of collapse.

In the bulging annals of U.S. failure abroad, Bolivia thus has become another dismal case history. However, while the inevitable unhappy ending may come as no surprise, some of the twists and turns of the plot are calculated to jolt even a thick-skinned, case-hardened critic of this country's foreign policy. For in Bolivia, the record suggests, the United States either has acquiesced in or encouraged the deterioration of industry, the spread of corruption in high places and the decline of law and order. In the fair name of social reform, the Good Neighbor to the north has served as willing accomplice to nothing less than the political assassination of a whole economy. To rush mourners to the graveside, as Washington has done, may be the proper diplomatic rite. What justice cries out for, however, is a stern and thoroughgoing inquest.

Such a probe logically would go back to 1952, when a subversive movement, comprising in its pristine state a coalition of Communist and Nazi sympathizers, violently rose to power. Soon afterward, the new rulers of Bolivia seized the properties of the "tin barons" (for which, by the way, they still have not paid), distributed land to the peasants and launched far-reaching social reforms. As a result, despite its bloody origins, the Bolivian revolution gained the plaudits of many influential Americans, including one U.S. Senator who hailed it as a "miracle of the twentieth century," as well as easy access to the U.S. Treasury. During the past decade, U.S. aid to Bolivia has run to $20-$25 million per year, or over $200 million in all, a sum which on a per capita basis exceeds that given any other Latin American nation. Nor does the account end here. Earlier this month, as noted, the Inter-American Bank advanced $10 million to La Paz, and the Administration currently is weighing a request for an extra $20 million in "emergency" aid.

That a national emergency exists is clear enough. With its gold reserves fast nearing zero, La Paz last fall defaulted on its foreign debt. Deficits incurred by state-owned enterprise (which includes not only the tin mines, but also railroads and oil fields) have been mounting at a rapid rate. After a brief period of price stability, effected at U.S. behest, the cost of living again has begun to climb. In protest, the teachers and tin miners are out on a strike, and production and trade in general are grinding to a halt.

These are the overt signs of crisis which greeted the latest State Department mission to La Paz last week. What the U.S. officials did not see—and, if they prove no more astute than their many predecessors, what they never may recognize—are the deepseated roots of the evil. To begin with, like virtually every other country which has played the same stupid game, Bolivia is suffering acutely from socialism. The state-owned oil industry, for example, prices its products so low as to prevent any sensible effort at exploration or development. Prior to its seizure in 1959, the state-owned railroad (once the property of the Antofagasta and Bolivia Railway Co., Ltd.), under repressive government rate regulation, was running at a deficit of $1-$2 million per year; the annual loss now exceeds $12 million. As to the tin mines, the collapse has been positively startling. In 1951, the last full year of private ownership, these properties employed some 26,000 workers and produced, at a profit, 34,000 tons of metal. Today, contrariwise, payrolls have swelled to over 40,000; output has declined by more than one-third; and every pound of Bolivian tin, sold on the world market for approximately a dollar, costs over twice as much to produce.

Economically speaking, the revolution thus has all but ruined Bolivia. Despite its supposed concern with human rights, moreover, the Socialist regime has foisted on the hapless land an era of injustice second to none in its long, bloody history. To be sure, the tin barons (who, for all their faults, at least paid enough taxes to run the government) have gone. Their place, however, has been taken by a tight little clique of officials and their favorites, whose rapacity, by all accounts, knows no bounds. They, in turn, preserve their power by granting excessive benefits and free-and-easy working conditions to the unions of peasants and miners, which, organized into cadres of militia, today constitute far and away the largest armed force in the country. In subsidizing La Paz for nearly a decade, the U.S. thus willy-nilly has lent support not to social reform but to corruption, brigandage and tyranny.

Here, then, is a scandalous betrayal of every principle for which this country presumably stands. At the same time, the sorry state of affairs poses a constant threat to U.S. relations with the rest of Latin America. By its long and shabby flirtation with La Paz, Washington undoubtedly whetted the lawless ardor of the Castro regime in Havana. By the same token, it cannot have failed to dampen the hopes of all moderate, honest and democratic elements in the Western Hemisphere. In his message to Congress [last week], President Kennedy [unveiled] a huge new ten-year program to stimulate economic and social progress south of the border. What he does about Bolivia, however, will be a truer touchstone of U.S. policy in this part of the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Second Professorial Invasion

Book review of "Keynes at Harvard," a Veritas Foundation Staff Study, 114 pages, Veritas Foundation, Box 340, Wall Street Station, New York 5, N. Y. (paperbound) $2.

With the advent of a new administration in Washington, we are also witnessing what might be called the Second Professorial Invasion of our government. The first came during the early days of F.D.R.'s New Deal. We still have not recovered from its onslaught. Perhaps it is unfair to thousands of dedicated teachers to call this a "professorial" invasion. Rather it is an invasion of a certain type of academic mind along with those who have come under its influence. The fountainhead of this new march on Washington, as was the earlier one, is Harvard University whose current most distinguished alumnus is the new President himself. Even James Reston of the New York *Times* remarked, approvingly of course, that when Mr. Kennedy finishes raiding his alma mater to fill government posts, "it may be that Harvard will have nothing left but Radcliffe."

Fortunately, there are other Harvard alumni who remember when Harvard, the oldest college in America, was a highly respected educational institution with brilliant teachers and a reputation for scholarship equalled nowhere in the world. These alumni would like to see her recapture the stellar role she once held in the intellectual world—before she became, at least in her Economics Department, the font for all the crackbrained socialist, left-wing schemes that have made such inroads on our capitalist system. They therefore formed the Veritas (Truth, from the Harvard motto) Foundation for the purpose of carefully studying and exposing what has been happening at Harvard. The current book, subtitled *Economic Deception as a Political Credo*, could not possibly be more timely. Our poor old capitalist system is already reeling like a New Year's Eve drunk from the original Harvard invasion of Washington. The new one could very well send it into D. T.'s and death, if we do not quickly become aware of its basic objective.

It is the contention of this vividly presented study that the followers of British socialist John Maynard Keynes have for many years dominated the Economics faculty at Harvard University, that from Harvard they fanned out to spread their poison in many other colleges, that they have made and are now making again great inroads in Washington in a sort of secret government—secret because it is beyond the reach of the voters. Keynes, who called himself an economist, actually used economic deception as a political weapon. He pretended, with his weird theories of governmental extravagance and improvidence, to be saving the capitalist system. All the while, he and his disciples were busy—are still busy—undermining it in the interest of socialism which is their true objective. So slyly subtle is the assault that it has succeeded in convincing even some businessmen, who will be the first victims of its success, that it is their savior.

Keynes at Harvard names the names and number of top government officials who were Keynes followers. It amply proves, with chapter and verse, that Keynes' disciples formed the first Communist cells in our government and identifies some who turned out to be Communists or pro-Communists. And it properly brands Keynesism for what it is—not an economic theory but a "weapon of political conspiracy" and its followers as forming a " 'political underworld' " whose only difference with Communists and Fascists is one of method. The Keynesians "believe in 'easing' into absolute power by deceit. The Communists and Fascists believe in attaining power by violence. The ends are the same since absolute power can only be maintained by violent repression."

This is a most revealing document which will give all Americans a better understanding of proposals issuing from Washington in the coming months. —Rosalie Gordon in *America's Future*

Kennedy's Pipe Dream

I urge the Congress to raise the minimum wage immediately to $1.15 and to $1.25 within two years. This will improve the incomes, level of living, morale, and efficiency of many of our lowest paid workers, and provide incentives for their more productive utilization. This can actually increase productivity and hold down unit costs, with no adverse effects on our competition in world markets and our balance of payments.

—President Kennedy, Message to Congress February 2d.

The Moulding of Communists

The Moulding of the Communists, by Frank S. Meyer (Harcourt Brace, $5), offers bold and brilliant insights into the strategy used to shape men and women into effective and dedicated Communist Party leaders. The author himself was once a Communist leader for fourteen years in the United States, Great Britain, and Europe. His analysis of the party's methods and of its psychology is powerful and, in its implications, alarming.

The Moulding of Communists gives an inside story of the recruitment and training of leaders and of the purposes and procedures of the Communist Party and the party schools. Some of the most striking passages describe the psychological techniques used by the party to obtain complete and unswerving obedience, by altering and directing the personalities of its members, by intervention in sexual, marital, and other personal matters to eliminate all weaknesses that might endanger a party mission. The picture that emerges is of an organization committed to one end—leadership by the Communist Party and the supremacy of the Soviet Union—and willing to use any means to achieve it.

Thoughtful readers will find *The Moulding of Communists* an invaluable aid to enlightened democratic citizenship.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Congressmen Say

I frankly admire those Democrats who admitted the packing of the Rules Committee was needed to guarantee action on all of President Kennedy's proposals. This was honest politics. But phony liberals hid behind their actions by self-serving statements that the packing was necessary so that the House could work its will on every measure. These same radicals are now appearing in droves before the rubber stamp Rules Committee urging that various bills be bottled up so the House can't have a chance to vote on them.

—Robert C. Wilson (R.-Calif.)

One prominent Democrat, who has not yet received an appointment from the new Administration, advised his friends on Capitol Hill that he was applying for admission to the Harvard Summer School so he can qualify for a Federal appointment later on.

—Clarence J. Brown (R.-Ohio)

It is clear that the New Frontier sacrifices will not include any unnecessary waiting by the political faithful for appointment to judgeships, whether the judgeships are needed or not.

—John W. Byrnes (R.-Wis.)

Virtually *none* of the agriculture in the four counties comprising our Congressional District is subsidized, and we are about 14th in agricultural sales out of the 437 Congressional Districts in the country. Most of our own farmers would rather take their chances with the law of supply and demand and do not ask the Federal Government to support them.

—Charles M. Teague (R.-Calif.)

The Administration knows that it is going to be difficult to get [its Federal aid to education] bill passed. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare told me the other day that the bill he proposes is a "States' Rights" bill and that he desired and expected the help of those of us who believe in States' Rights to get the bill passed. That sounded very well on the surface, but his next remark shocked me. He followed up by saying that if his so-called "States' Rights" bill didn't pass and if those of us who believe in States' Rights didn't vote for it, that next year there would be presented to the Congress an entirely different type of bill and that any "States' Rights" provisions would be eliminated. I suppose he meant by that that there would be everything in this bill that those of us who advocate States' Rights oppose, and that any Federal aid received would be predicated on complete Federal control, such as requiring integration in schools before any money could be received.

—A. Sydney Herlong, Jr. (D.-Fla.)

Congressmen by Professions

The makeup of the Congress: Law—House, 56%, Senate, 63%; Agriculture—House, 11%, Senate 18%; Business or Banking—both, 31%; Journalism—House, 8%, Senate, 10%; Medicine and Engineering—House, 2%; Senate 3%; and Teaching—House, 9%, Senate, 14%.

Human Nature

"The prime fact of human nature which the wise statesman must take into account is that men will exert themselves for their own benefit, or for that of their families, regarded as an extension of themselves, as they will exert themselves for no one else; and, in particular, men are not prepared to work for the state or for any other collectivity as they will work for themselves or for their families. Perhaps this is a defect in human nature, but it is a fact, and the statesman ignores it at his peril."

—Ivor Thomas, British writer

Lausche Hits Farm Program

By Carl DeBloom in the *Columbus Dispatch*

U.S. Senator Frank J. Lausche (D.-Ohio) made a bitter attack on administration farm legislation before the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation here last night.

Lausche said the Democratic bills now before Congress are examples of "giving with the right hand and taking it back with the left."

At one point in his heated speech in the Continental Hotel, Lausche seemed to take a crack at the entire approach to the economy by the Congress when he said that before the session is over "you'll see how the price squeeze, [as it] has been applied to you, has been aggravated."

"The Freeman program shackles the farmer," Lausche declared. "In effect it is a sop."

Charging that the Freeman program is the "same tune you have been hearing for years and years," Lausche said:

"The Freeman program fails to face the problem on a long range permanent basis."

He said the one-year temporary program backed by the administration is the result of "fear to come to grips with the problem."

Describing one feature of the Freeman plan which would permit the government to dump surplus grains on the market in competition with farmers, Lausche said: "It is just unbelievable."

He said this plan would permit the government to force farmers to join the price support program for grains since those who do not accept supports could be undersold by the government. He also pointed out that farmers would be in the position of selling grain at the price support level and buying it back at less money from the government.

All orders for bound volumes of HUMAN EVENTS for 1960 have been filled. The last shipment left Washington March 15.

REPRINTS of this section available: single copy 20c; 10 for $1; 25 for $2; 100 for $5; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. Order by section number and date of issue.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate $12.50; 6 months $6.50. After you have read each section of HUMAN EVENTS, put it in an envelope and mail it to someone else who will value its contents.

Published weekly at 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Disintegration of Our School System

By WATSON WASHBURN
The author is a distinguished New York attorney who was graduated summa cum laude from Harvard in 1914. He was a member of the victorious US Davis Cup tennis teams of 1920-21

MUCH HAS BEEN SAID lately about integration in our schools. And there is no doubt that this has become a major problem since the revolutionary decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* on May 17, 1954, which reversed the contrary rule of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson,* upon which since 1896 the segregated school systems of our Southern states had been developed with ever-increasing improvement, particularly in the colored schools, until they were suddenly confronted with the shocking impact of the Supreme Court's about-face.

However, while "integration" has become an explosive and dangerous problem in the South, it does not compare in evil consequences with the countrywide "disintegration" of our educational system which has been going on largely unnoticed for the past 30 years, until its awful results have finally attracted public attention—let us hope before it is too late.

The most striking example of this disintegration, as well as the simplest and easiest to understand, is in the teaching of reading—the very first of the Three R's. Catastrophe here followed slowly but surely the abandonment of the alphabet as the foundation of reading instruction, and the substitution of configuration. Configurationism requires children to memorize the appearance of whole words, regardless of the individual letters which compose them, whereas the alphabetic method requires only the memorization of the 26 letters of our alphabet in their conventional order, plus the learning of the sounds which these letters represent—considerably more than 26 sounds, for some letters, particularly the vowels, represent more than one sound, but of course infinitely less than the number of separate words. The alphabetical method is often referred to as "phonics."

The advantages of the alphabetical over the word-by-word system are so overwhelming that it is incredible that the latter should have been imposed upon most of the country's public schools, and adopted by many private or independent ones; but this is obviously another case where we took things for granted for so long that we forgot how important they were and that they must be fought for to be preserved.

The alphabet was invented over 3000 years ago, and in due course adopted by all the leading nations of Western civilization, beginning with Greece. In the intellectual field, the discovery was universally considered like that of fire in anthropology, or the wheel in mechanics.

The addition which the alphabet brought to the human mind was not limited to the simplification of reading, enormous as this contribution was. The intellectual stimulation and training involved in building single-syllable words from the letters, and then poly-syllables, gave children a fine start toward mathematics and logic. Also, complete familiarity with the order of the letters (which can be memorized by the ordinary child of four in an hour or two) permitted children to use freely and efficiently for the rest of their lives indexes, catalogues and works of reference of all kinds (including in this age the telephone book) which are very slow and frustrating implements to employ for those who have been denied this fundamental training. Further, since the alphabet is the same in English as in other Western languages, the study of these languages is greatly helped by a thorough grounding in our own alphabet.

AFTER THIS MARVELOUS invention was adapted by the Greeks to enlarge so magnificently their linguistic and intellectual horizons, it became a common-place attitude to look down on the benighted savages who resorted to picture-writing of one kind or another, and also to pity the nations whose considerable progress in civilization had been stunted by the lack of an alphabet, such as the Egyptians with their hieroglyphics, and the Chinese with their tens of thousands of separate characters which called for the ability and patience of a Mandarin to assimilate. But even the primitive picture writing of the American Indians or other native tribes, or the much more intricate and sophisticated Chinese characters, are vastly superior pedagogically to the configurationism of our top professional educationists, for the picture-writings used by these people have some resemblance to the meanings signified: among the primitives, the likeness may be obvious, like the figure of a cat or a boat; in Chinese, the conventionalized character may be much more obscure, but to the expert scholar it has a number of stimulating associations. In vivid contrast, the shape of our alphabetized words has no relevance whatever to the meaning. Even the most avant-garde painter would hardly use the configuration "cat" to depict a cat, just as conversely, unfortunate children who have been subjected to this modern perversity are likely to read "boat" as "ship."

Copyright 1961 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This educationist madness therefore is much more of a backward step than merely to the year of 1500 B.C., before the alphabet. It is more irrational than the caveman or apeman, who never would have imagined such a self-defeating attempt to mix oil and water. In fact, it has no point of reference in the whole of normal history, and seems suitable only for psychiatric study.

Some contourists advance as an excuse for their peculiar theory, the fact that a mature reader can devour pages of print at a speed incompatible with the "sounding out" of each letter in every word. From this simple truism they solemnly draw the illogical conclusion that such a reader must be identifying the words by their outlines, and further that if this is true (a false assumption) the way to become a fast reader is to begin by memorizing the outlines. It is hard to take such a suggestion seriously.

The fact is that the alphabetically trained leader has always readily acquired the facility of fast reading; this is so because with constant practice the marvelous brain mechanism steadily speeds up until soon reading becomes automatic and subconscious. The brain reads each letter far faster than conscious thought could imagine. This is a common phenomenon with all skills. In fact, it is essential to the expert in any activity. The golfer who thought of every little motion while hitting the ball would never break a hundred. But the champion's brain does all this work for him automatically.

This crazy method was introduced with such little fanfare into our educational system that it largely escaped public notice until its baneful effects finally forced the issue into the open. The increasing number of unfortunate pupils who had later to take special remedial reading courses attracted the attention of their parents. So did the fact that the usual reading defects disclosed were evidently connected with the configurational method of instruction, and that the standard remedy was the alphabet.

Cure was much slower than prevention, for these older children had to unlearn all their bad reading habits at an age when their minds had lost some of the elasticity of childhood. The question naturally arose why, if the alphabet (or "phonics") was the only way to teach these retarded children to read, it was not also the rational way to teach *all* children in the first place, thus avoiding altogether the painful expedient of the "remedial" classes.

One of the by-products of contour-reading is the disappearance of good handwriting and correct spelling. The accuracy required to write the letters clearly and to spell properly is wholly foreign to configurationism.

ANOTHER UNWHOLESOME excretion of configurationism is the reading matter which the unfortunate pupils are forced to swallow. Since the number of word shapes which children can memorize in a year is limited to two or three hundred and since without knowledge of the alphabet they are helpless if confronted with a new word, the texts given them for intellectual fodder have to be tailored to this Procrustean measure. The result resembles the repetitious drooling of hopeless senility. Naturally, no one with an ounce of literary ability or creative imagination would dream of writing such inhibited nonsense. It is no wonder that many young pupils are nauseated, and never recover the taste for reading which familiarity with Lewis Carroll or Hans Christian Andersen might have developed in them.

When the awful truth dawned on the American people, and Rudolph Flesch's *Why Johnny Can't Read* became a best seller in 1955, the reaction of the angry educationists was two-fold.

First, they made bitter personal attacks on the author, and any others who had the temerity to support his views, as "enemies of public schools," "reactionary ignoramuses,"—in fact, the usual complimentary epithets bestowed by the apostles of academic freedom on those whose views on any subject differ from theirs. This was similar to the attempts they made more recently to endorse a school boycott against the largest national weeklies for publishing criticisms of so-called "progressive" education.

But the case for picture-reading was so pitifully weak that even the well-entrenched bureaucrats of the National Education Association felt it wise to establish a second line of defense. This was to deny that the alphabet had been relegated to obscurity, and to assert on the contrary that the New Teaching had merely embellished the old-fashioned A-B-C system with some modern improvements, of which picture-reading was only one, the whole being thus described in "Phonics and the ABC's—1955," an official publication of the New York State Education Department: "*accurate and careful listening, correct and clear pronunciation, a constantly increasing sight word vocabulary, picture and context clues, general configuration* of words, and the *composition* of the word. These skills should be used along with phonics, sometimes one, sometimes another, being the best aid to the recognition of a particular word."

This secondary defense was just as absurd as the direct counter-offensive. For it should be obvious even to a mind of elementary grade that the logical alphabetic mode of expression is wholly incompatible with primitive pictography. This is like harnessing a horse to a jet plane. The Teachers' College men were as far off base with this alleged eclecticism or middle-of-the-road theory as an arithmetic instructor caught teaching that two and two make five, who offered to compromise on four and a half. Actually, the established hierarchy never give the alphabet a chance, in the first years of school when the pupils' minds are malleable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WE MAY THANK our lucky stars that our educationists have so far allowed children to learn to talk, in the old-fashioned way, at home with their families. Learning to talk from a scratch start, as babies must, is obviously far more difficult than learning to read after mastering oral communication. Just what particular form of new nonsense our configurationists would invent to bedevil the babies with is hard to imagine, but the wreckage they have left behind in the reading field justifies the most pessimistic prophecies. For one thing, we may be reasonably sure that they would apply the concept of "reading readiness" to speaking.

If a boy of five is slow in reading, common sense would seem to recommend special effort and longer hours to bring him up to average, but the current dogma calls for abandonment of all reading instruction for an indefinite period, until "readiness" arrives. By analogy, babies backward in conversation would be discouraged from further babbling till their teacher could discern the necessary growth of the requisite "skill" in their little brains. This might prolong the period of dumbness for a good many years, but children so early grounded by their own experience in "progressive" technique would probably still be dumb enough when grown to get a diploma from Teachers' College and carry on the good work from generation to generation.

The inertia of the bureaucrats in charge of the public school system of most states, and the intolerance of the despots of the National Education Association, make the task of abolishing from the top even such an absurdity as configurationism almost insurmountable. These people doubtless fear that confession of such a gross error would hamper their master plan of securing control of billions of dollars of new Federal money for spreading their peculiar pedagogical theories.

It may seem strange, in view of the shocking perversions of proper methods of instruction so consistently practiced by the highest educationist authorities for more than a score of years, how so many young Americans are still able to read tolerably well. The great majority have mastered this accomplishment by the time they enter college, and only a small percentage then require remedial tutoring.

The answer is that numbers of parents, defying the warnings of the educationists, have taught their children to read in the normal way; and so have countless teachers, who from the practical experience with youngsters which the Teachers' College pundits lack, have learned that picture-reading leads to a comic-strip mentality and either a remedial reading class or a reformatory.

Contour-reading alone has set back the education of American children in public schools by at least two years on the average, according to the experienced authors—one a remedial reading teacher and the other a professor of English—of the recent book: *Reading: Chaos and Cure*. It has permanently crippled the minds of millions. But while this is the clearest and most demonstrable mis-step of so-called "progressive" education, it also typifies similar perversions in almost every branch of public education, the poisonous effects of which have seeped into many college programs as well. The over-all picture is one of reducing the American people to a dull uniform level of ignorant conformity and acceptance of socialism, instead of educating them to be intelligent, independent-thinking, freedom-loving individuals.

The apparent impossibility of persuading the educationist bosses to correct their contour-reading aberration high-lights the folly of trying to change their other more complex educational fallacies. The reform of these pernicious practices must evidently begin at grass-roots level. Fortunately, the public schools are still largely controlled locally, and a few active and well-informed crusaders in a community can soon accomplish wonders. The rank and file of teachers, who are a fine group of citizens, will often be found sympathetic with reform, though afraid to express their feelings openly for fear of reprisals by their intolerant superiors.

MOREOVER, the competition of private and parochial schools should have a healthy influence on the public education system. This will be much stronger if, as seems likely, there is a mushroom growth of private schools in some Southern states. Generally speaking, any government activity in the United States is run much less efficiently than private enterprises. This built-in advantage of private schools will be vastly increased if they add to it the use of common sense methods which are barred to the public schools by the peculiar combination of political and Teachers' College control.

It is also essential to any worth-while reform that the Federal Office of Education be reduced in scope, if not altogether abolished—if such a thing can happen to a Washington Bureau! At present it operates in the closest collaboration with officials of the National Education Association. This little group of willful men must not be allowed to convert American schools into laboratories of illiteracy.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 410 First Street, S. E. Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE DISINTEGRATION OF OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles add 1c per copy; for airmail add 2c per copy

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $12.50

Street _____

Name _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Fight Is On. Your Help Needed.

New Frontier proposals are now before Congress. Will you TODAY make up a list of persons in your community, in your profession or line of business who are eager to enlist in this fight—persons, who, when informed WHAT to do, will then DO it.

Send them $1 five-week subscriptions to HUMAN EVENTS.

Note the FREE books you get if you send us 10, 20, or 30 $1 subscriptions.

Mail your order TODAY to HUMAN EVENTS, 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

Sender

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... **Zone** ..... **State** .....

Send me:

(CHECK ONE)

☐ *The Herbert Hoover Story* (Value $5.90) FREE if you send us 10 or more subscriptions.

☐ *The ACA-Index* (Value $15) FREE if you send us 20 or more subscriptions.

☐ BOTH BOOKS (Value $20.90) FREE if you send us 30 or more subscriptions.

☐ Payment Enclosed ☐ Bill me

ENTER THE FOLLOWING 5-WEEK TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AT $1 EACH:

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

Name .....
Address .....
City ..... Zone ..... State .....
☐ Send Gift Card

The coupons give you space for 14 subscriptions. Put additional names on a separate sheet.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED